

Page Denied

Hoover - Stanford In Conflict

by PHILIP TAUBMAN
(Last in a series)

Glenn Campbell, director of the Hoover Institution, graphically illustrated the tenor of the relationship between the University and the Institution recently.

When asked about faculty requests for consultation on Hoover appointments, he replied: "I wish the faculty would keep their noses out of my business."

Talks with numerous professors indicate they feel equally adamant that the University should forcefully get into the Institution's business, and especially Campbell's business.

This conflict stems directly from the official University rules that govern the relationship. The most sensitive and controversial conflicts arise over the method for staff and director appointments at Hoover.

Make Things Official

After many years of functioning on the basis of understood agreements, the University and Herbert Hoover decided to make things official in 1959. The Stanford Board of Trustees passed a resolution incorporating many requirements that seemed unusual, but Herbert Hoover insisted they be included.

The relationship is outlined in Paragraph 3 of that resolution. "The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace is an in-

dependent Institution within the frame of Stanford University.

"Its relation to the University is that the President of the University will propose all appointments, promotions and the budget of the Institution directly to the Board of Trustees. There will be no reference to any faculty committees between the President and the Trustees."

Special Privileges

The phrase, "No reference to any faculty committees," is what raises the ire of professors. Why, they ask, is the Hoover Institution allowed to appoint its own staff when University departments are not granted the same privilege?

The specific issues involved in such a question are complex and have often thrown the whole inquiry into a quagmire of ambiguity.

The faculty members feel, in general, that the autonomy given

to the Institution allows the director to create a staff in his own image. The trustee resolution declares: "The Director shall be responsible through the President of the University to the Trustees for: (a) recommending appointments to and supervising the staff of the Institution."

Centralized Power

Combined with the rule not allowing the President to consult with faculty committees on such appointments, it is clear that the power resides with the director of Hoover and the President. The faculty is not even consulted.

Professors feel this system gives almost complete appointment power to Campbell since President Sterling can't spend time combing the country for Institution personnel.

They explain, for comparison, the system all faculty departments follow. If a position is vacant, all members of the department with the rank of that position or higher, may form a search committee.

When they have a list of possibilities, they pass it on to the Advisory Board of the Academic Council, pressing for the appointment of one individual on

the list. A complete dossier on all possibilities must be included.

The whole faculty, represented by the Advisory Board, has a crucial voice in individual department appointments. If they turn down a person, he is out of the picture.

Board Limited

The Advisory Board, however, is limited in a very important direction. It cannot appoint anyone without acceptance by the department involved.

At Hoover the staff does not have power to suggest nor to reject appointments. The director thus is able to act alone in the vacuum if he desires.

This is exactly what professors claim Campbell does, filling the vacuum by effectively making all appointments himself.

Activities Questioned

They point to people such as Stefan Possony and Richard Allen, saying they carry on activities that can hardly be called academic and thus reflect very badly on the University.

Campbell, they claim, is able to perpetuate his own political views to such an extent that the whole Institution becomes infected with his unscholarly dogmatism.

Some Hoover people suggest
(Continued on page 3)

Stanford Daily 12 Oct 67

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1967

Hoover-Stanford Conflict

(Continued from page 1)

such faculty criticism is unwarranted and out of place because Hoover employees are not part of the University faculty and thus do not necessarily have to incorporate every ideal of the Stanford faculty.

Many Ways To Contribute

Professors reply that there are many ways to contribute to a university. If you are part of the university then whatever you do reflects on the whole university, whether it be publishing, researching, traveling or teaching.

As an example, one professor of History complained that Hoover employees always parade around academic conferences wearing Stanford tags, without

telling anyone they come from Hoover.

Several Stanford professors noted that the problem might have been slightly relieved if the Trustee resolution hadn't completely tied everyone's hands, including the President's, on the matter of Director appointment.

President Recommends

The resolution reads: "The Director of the Institution shall be recommended to the Board of Trustees by the President of the University for appointment by the Trustees. He shall have been previously approved by Mr. Hoover."

Since Mr. Hoover founded the Institution and supplied it with personal funds, the stage was set

for appointment of anyone he wanted, even if others thought the choice unqualified or unsuitable.

It is known that many members of the University community were not happy with the choice of Campbell, but Mr. Hoover had his way nevertheless.

Power To Be Limited

It is the University's understanding that in the choice of future directors, Mr. Hoover's estate and two sons, Herbert Jr. and Allen, will not have the same powers of approval.

Not as controversial, though important to both the Institution and the University, are the financial ties that bind them.

It was agreed in the 1959 resolution that not less than \$125,000 per annum would be given to the Institution from Stanford general funds. The understanding at both Hoover and in the University budget office is that this money will go only into the library. The Institution must provide its own funds for research and publication.

The University is also closely involved in gifts given to the Institution. All gifts and donations to Hoover must be given to Stanford for the Hoover Institution.

Check On Funding

This gives the University a check on Hoover funding. Stanford will not accept gifts that have any strings attached or that will lead to a diversifying venture the University wants to avoid.

As part of this arrangement, the Hoover Institution gets the tax-exempt status which the University enjoys. Without it, fund raising would be greatly curtailed.

Such tax-exemption is granted to only non-political organizations.

THE STANFORD DAILY

VOLUME 152, NUMBER 13

EDITORIAL, 321-2300 EXT. 4632, BUSINESS 327-4150

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1967

Controversy Dominates Hoover Research

By PHILIP TAUBMAN

In 1959-60 the Hoover Institution invested \$38,000 or 10 percent of its budget in research and publications. By 1964-65 that figure had jumped to \$533,000 or 43 percent of the budget.

This change signaled a shift in direction at Hoover, making it, as Director Glenn Campbell described, "more and more a center for advanced study."

Controversy has grown with the advanced study. The Hoover staff includes spokesmen for diametrically opposed political viewpoints such as Stefan Possony, famous for his ultra-conservatism, and Theodore Draper, a leading writer with liberal views. Possony is the object of numerous attacks for his active political and military affiliations. It has been suggested, in fact, that except for a few individuals such as Draper, the Hoover research and publications program is an organ for anti-communist propaganda.

Flare-up in 1960's

Part of this claim is based on a flare-up in the early 1960s. In 1959 the Stanford Board of Trustees passed a resolution concerning the relationship of the University and the Institution. Attached to this resolution was a preface written by Herbert Hoover. He wrote, in part:

"The purpose of this Institution must be, by its research and publications, to demonstrate the evils of the doctrines of Karl Marx—whether Communism, Socialism, economic materialism, or atheism—thus to protect the American way of life from such ideologies, their conspiracies, and to reaffirm the validity of the American system."

It seems that this preface didn't come to the public's attention until early in 1960. In the March 29th and 30th issues of The Daily, it appeared in print though the exact sequence of events is unclear.

Faculty Protests

Evidently some time earlier in the year, the faculty saw the preface and violently protested. At a February meeting of the Board, the Trustees adopted a statement noting that the preface was not meant to be part of the resolution, but rather only Hoover's personal evaluation of goals. In the same statement, the Trustees said they stood for free inquiry at Hoover.

The March 29th issue of the Daily included an interview with Campbell, who had just been appointed Director on January 1st. Asked about the preface, he is quoted as saying, "I see nothing wrong with it, do you?" He also said, "There are evils in Marxism, and I hope we expose them."

Campbell was Herbert Hoover's last appointee as Director of the Institution. A Canadian by birth, Campbell came to the Institution from The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research in Washington, where he had been Research Director. The Institute does studies on recent major legislation. Since his appointment at Hoover, the Institution has grown rapidly, bringing with it continuing controversy.

Financial Crises

In 1959 the Hoover Institution faced a financial crisis. Its budget was \$390,000 and the Institution was going nowhere. Easton Rothwell had retired as Director to become President of Mills College, though many observers still suggest he was pushed out by Herbert Hoover because he couldn't raise funds, and protected liberal scholars working in the library.

When Campbell was appointed he immediately sought ways to

raise funds. One method was through publications. Since its earliest days, the library had published a few titles each year. This reached a peak during the 1930s, but became practically extinct during the '50s. Campbell rapidly enlarged this department. By 1962 the Institution was publishing over 30 books a year. At the same time, Campbell began to concentrate on establishing a large and active research staff.

The results were soon apparent. Foundations, especially the Ford, and private donors around the country, began to pour money into the Institution.

Use Funds Productively

Speaking of this phenomenon, Campbell says, "Most people think it's impossible to get funds for a library. That's not so, but to get them you have to show they are going to be used productively, such as in a research and publications program."

With the gifts, the programs grew and the gifts in turn enlarged. In 1966-67, the Institution received over \$1,600,000 in gifts and grants. At the same time, over 100 research projects are in progress and the Institution has it owns large hierarchy of researchers.

Today controversy centers on these researchers more than the Institution's philosophy. As a whole, some critics still claim the atmosphere isn't conducive to objective study.

One professor of Political Science at Stanford said, "There is no pressure for objectivity at Hoover." Another commented: "As long as they have the scholars they do now, nothing positive will come out of Hoover."

There seems to be no factual support for charges of any actual interference by Institution administrators in the work of researchers.

Theodore Draper has been a research fellow at Hoover for four years, during which he has written four books. His most recently published work is *The Abuse of Power*, an analysis of America's policy in Vietnam, about which he is strongly critical.

He said in a recent interview, "I have had no interference from anyone. I do nothing but my own work and it's done just as I please. I tell publishers and magazines to send copies of my material to Hoover. They see nothing until it's published."

Draper is going to Yale this January as a visiting professor for six months. He plans to return to Hoover where he has a contract for three more years.

Many scholars consider Draper's presence at Hoover a token concession to the liberal point of view. They argue that the Institution uses Draper's presence to

fend off liberal criticism of right wing bias in the staff.

Most charges of such bias are directed at Stefan Possony, Director of the International Studies Program at Hoover. He came to Hoover in 1961 from Georgetown University, where he was a professor.

His actions have led numerous scholars to question not so much his conservative views as the propriety of his using a supposedly academic institution for a broadcasting platform.

They cite his active participation in the Goldwater presidential campaign, his defense of South African apartheid, and his contributions to Air Force projects.

Possony suggests that not all the charges are true. "I did not work for Barry Goldwater. I sent in occasional suggestions, but never left the Hoover staff."

Part of the apartheid case con-

(Continued on Page 4)

to high school newspapers

(Continued from page 1)

cerns a letter he sent to the New York Times in November, 1965. Possony wrote in part, "In brief, there is no legally persuasive evidence to substantiate the allegations of oppression which Liberia and Ethiopia initially presented to the International Court."

His military associations include work on a report for the House Armed Services Committee prepared by the American Security Council, a privately run group. Possony is on its Board of Directors. The recommendations, entitled, "The Changing Strategic Military Balance: USA vs. USSR," were made by a 17 man committee. Fourteen were military men, none of lower rank than Lt. General or Vice Admiral, two were "professors" including Possony, and a third civilian was the physicist Dr. Edward Teller, a well known hawk.

Political Objectivity

Possony defended his political objectivity in a recent interview. "I supported both a Republican and a Democrat in 1964. I voted for Goldwater, but I also backed Senator Thomas Dodd, a Democrat from Connecticut." Dodd was censured by the Senate this year for ethical irregularities.

A Stanford Professor of History termed Possony, "a great misfortune." Campbell defends his staff member. Asked about, "Mr. Possony's activities," Campbell said, "Please refer to him as Dr. Possony. The only thing that distinguishes him from other faculty members is that he disagrees with them. Others should look at their own glass houses. Possony's position is perfectly reasonable."

As part of its research program, Hoover has begun to take on government contracts. Most recently it finished a report on arms control for the Far East prepared for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

ver has accepted, but others may be in the offing.

Government Contracts

Campbell says that the only thing that might substantially enlarge the research program would be government contracts. He notes, however, that, "Hoover is not in the contract business. We take only contracts that fit into our research and publications program."

All Hoover contracts must pass through regular University clearing channels.

The Hoover Institution expanded publications program is directed by Karol Maichel who is also curator of the Eastern Europe collection. Maichel points out that Hoover is neither a commercial publisher nor a regular university press.

Most Institution books are published under Hoover imprint by other presses such as Stanford, Praeger, Chicago, Cambridge, etc. Some books are printed in foreign countries to lower their retail price in the United States.

Hoover critics suggest prices are inflated anyway. One person, involved in Hoover publications said their recent book, *The Pol-*

tics of the Chinese Red Army was intentionally printed in large type and on extra thick paper so the price could be raised. The book sells for \$35.00.

Low Academic Standards

Many members of the academic community claim the level of Hoover books is far below even mediocre academic standards. They suggest the books are heavily weighted toward anti-communist propaganda.

Maichel outlined the requirements a book needs for publication by Hoover. "It must be read by two Hoover people, and then by two people outside Hoover, unless it is written by a Hoover person. In that case, all four readers come from outside the Institution. If any of these people question the objectivity or value of a book, its chances of publication are very small."

Writers are not told who reads their books and Maichel would not name any readers Hoover has used.

One of the Institution's specialties is printing bibliographies for scholars. These books attempt to give a scholar one source for finding all other

sources on a particular topic. For example there is the *Guide to Russian Reference Books* prepared by Maichel.

Ambitious Project

The most ambitious publication project at Hoover is the *Yearbook On International Communist Affairs*. The editor is Richard V. Allen, who formerly headed the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University.

The yearbook will be an overview of the year's activities and thoughts in communist parties around the world. Material on 90 parties will be included in over 1000 pages of material. Allen describes it as, "a compendium without judgement."

Allen is one of the more outspoken Hoover staff members. He testified before Congress against ratification of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty. He has written several books on communism, including *Peace or Peaceful Coexistence* written for the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Education Against Communism.

Hoover finances and administration will be examined tomorrow.

In Hoover Tower

Politics And Money Allied?

By PHILIP TAUBMAN
(Third of Four Parts)

Do politics and money walk hand in hand with the administration of the Hoover Institution?

In 1964 Glenn Campbell, Director of Hoover, took a two month leave-of-absence to "run Barry Goldwater's advisory task force."

The Allen-Bradley Co., which donates \$50,000 a year to the Institution, is quoted in the Wall Street Journal: "One of our basic policies is to support anti-communist and conservative organizations. The Institution falls right in with this policy."

Allan H. Belmont was appointed executive assistant to the director of the Institution after 29 years with the FBI, where he was chief assistant for investigations to J. Edgar Hoover.

A member of the Hoover Institution Advisory Board, which oversees operations at Hoover but has no decision-making power, donated a half-million dollars last year.

Lack of Objectivity

Many scholars claim this evidence indicates a conservative, money-oriented core runs through the Advisory Board and administration of Hoover instilling a bias in the Institution unsuitable for objective scholarship.

Glenn Campbell suggests such claims are "uninformed criticism." He adds, "Look at the balance on our staff."

Such conflict of opinion arises partly from differing interpretations of the role an administra-

tion should play in a library and center for research and publication.

One Man Rule

Most scholars question whether one man or group should control the administration of Hoover Institution. They point out that such a situation could lead to perpetuation of a consistent ideology whether liberal or conservative, in staff appointments and publishing practices.

From interviews with 13 key people at Hoover and numerous talks with Stanford administrators and professors, several facts emerge.

Glenn Campbell, and only Glenn Campbell, runs the operations at Hoover. Various ties exist with the University administration — (these will be examined tomorrow), but past resolutions and agreements leave Campbell with great autonomy.

Goldwater Association

His political philosophy is conservative, as indicated by his association with Goldwater. His two top administrative aides, the Associate Director Swarakowski, and the Executive Assistant to the Director, Belmont, concur with that general philosophy.

Sworakowski is a Polish refugee who became a naturalized citizen of the United States. He has been with the Institution for 21 years. During a tour of the library he described his contempt for communism and those who support it. He considers it a form of support not to speak out against communism.

(Continued on Page 7)

Politics And Money

Stanford Herald 11/18/67

(Continued from Page 1)

He added, when asked about dealings with the CIA, "I am an American and I must answer any questions my country asks. If the CIA comes to me asking about people I know around the world, I will answer."

Bias Eliminator

Belmont came to Hoover in 1966 having retired from the third ranking position in the FBI for "personal and family reasons." He describes his position at Hoover as "a trouble shooter for the Director." He adds, "One of my jobs is to eliminate bias in the Institution."

In a recent interview Belmont spoke about the FBI. "The FBI is a fine organization. Its ideals are admirable and the people there are very fine. It has good tight discipline, the type that produces good results."

Belmont also talked about his present relationship with the FBI. "I have no associations. People do come around once in a while to ask about parts of my testimony before the Warren Commission. But the things I learned at the FBI were for the organization and not for me. I can't divulge it unless, of

course, J. Edgar Hoover gives me permission."

Belmont acts as chairman of the Hoover committee for research and publications.

Fund-Raisers

These three men are the core of the administration and as such one of their major jobs is fund raising. They get some help on this job from the University but more comes through their own efforts. The Hoover Advisory Board is crucial to this task.

The majority of its members represent huge money interests. For example, the director of Gulf Oil, chairman of the board of IBM, the executive vice president of Union Carbide, to name only a few.

Richard M. Schaife, vice president and governor of Mellon and Sons, is a member of the family that gave the Institution \$500,000 this year.

Million Dollar Budget

The Board, in fact, does such a successful job of fund raising that the Institution took in more this year than it will spend. According to the budget for 1966-67, the Institution will spend \$1,128,000. It has raised over \$1.6 million and will receive another \$297,000 from University general funds.

The discrepancy arises because a large chunk of the money Hoover raises is earmarked for its endowment fund and does not go toward any specific budget expenditures.

The breakdown of the Hoover budget this year is: administra-

tion, \$87,300; library, \$580,000; research and publications, \$406,000; and the Herbert Hoover archives, \$55,000.

Trustees Lead Drive

Seeing the need for a stable source of income, Campbell inaugurated a drive in 1964 to increase the Hoover endowment by \$5 million. This drive is being directed by two members of the Advisory Board, David Packard, chairman of the board of Hewlett-Packard Co. and Thomas P. Pike, chairman of the board of the Pike Co. of America. Both are Stanford trustees.

The growth of endowment, fund raising, and budget, generates questions crucial to the future of the Hoover Institution. In 1959-60 the total Hoover budget was \$389,000. Of that, 38 per cent came from University general funds. Today, 26 per cent comes from the University.

Hoover is thus becoming more financially independent. It already has more administrative independence than many Stanford faculty members and administrators think justifiable.

These facts inspire criticism that Hoover will increasingly move away from the domain of the University, carrying with it its peculiar approach to scholarship.

Such a possibility depends to a great extent on the relationship, both official and understood, between the University and the Institution. This relationship will be examined tomorrow in the final article of this series.

Hoover—Liberal Intolerance

by Fritz Schaefer

I have been reading with interest the recent series of articles in the Hoover Institution by one of the *Daily's* aspiring young writers.

The attitudes of Stanford's "intellectual" hierarchy toward the Hoover Institution bring forth clearly an essential facet of the academic community — intolerance towards those who hold right-wing views.

When Prof. Mancall, to cite a recent example, gets up and stands forth with the usual shelfful of naive clichés about immoral war in Vietnam, the slanders of anti-Communism, etc., not only does he even think to put him down "using a supposedly academic institution for a broadcast platform."

All the good "liberals" just pat Mancall on the back and congratulate him for doing his humanitarian duty. The same sort of thing happens when the esteemed Prof. Novak condemns the entire structure of American society.

Guardians Of Freedom
But, when Dr. Stefan Possony of the Hoover Institution dares to take issue with these guardians of academic freedom on the war in Vietnam or the anti-missile issue, he is immediately de-

nounced in unison by the left-wing academic establishment.

A Stanford History Professor calls Dr. Possony "a great misfortune." Yes, indeed, he is a great misfortune to those professors who see their calling in life as the brainwashing of American youth with their leftist ideology.

Dr. Possony is a serious roadblock to those who envision education as a process of indoctrination, rather than a confrontation between opposing philosophies and a searching for the truth. The *Daily* writer refers to Dr. Possony as a "professor", in quotes, the clear implication being that only those who hold the proper left-wing views are entitled to be called professors. Why is it that the same standards of academic freedom which are applied to a liberal cannot be applied to a conservative?

Professor Newleft

The real reason the academic hierarchy doesn't like the Hoover Institution is that the Hoover Institution's Researchers often present ideas which are alien to the academe's radical goals. The "liberals" would rather not see these ideas discussed seriously.

Professor Newleft says he wants Hoover destroyed because

it "is an organ for anti-communist propaganda," but what he really means is that he doesn't want the dangers of communism to be discussed intelligently.

The Hoover Institution's library contains a record of the monstrous atrocities which fifty years of communism have brought and continue to bring the world—millions of humans being slaughtered and the freedoms of those allowed to live deprived.

With this record always in the background at Stanford, it makes it all the more ridiculous for Professor Newleft to condemn anti-communism. No wonder the leftists are challenging Hoover's right to exist.

Pot And Kettle

The *Daily* headline reads "Right Wing Bias Charged at

Hoover." I would venture to say that the Stanford University Humanities Faculty is farther to the left than the Hoover Institution is to the right. Surely this is a classic example of the pot calling the kettle black.

The search for truth, which should be the purpose of a University, is best conducted in an atmosphere which lends itself to the intelligent presentation of opposing points of view.

Without the Hoover Institution, the so-called search for truth, which is supposed to be going on at Stanford, would be even more ludicrous than it already is.

It is typical of the hypocrisy of the academic hierarchy that it resents the Hoover Institution, a force which greatly contributes to that goal which the University pretends to aspire to—the truth.

Hoover Institution

Is an Institute unscholarly if it holds a right-wing bias?

The obvious answer is no. However, if that right-wing or even left-wing bias leads to active political affiliation and narrowly defined goals for research and publications, then it does become unscholarly.

The Hoover Institution is at once the pride and scandal of Stanford. The library resources on war, revolution, and peace are among the finest in the world. Scholars who visit the Hoover receive great cooperation in their research. The conference now going on is a broadly-based and scholarly gathering of the highest rank.

However, the internal workings and most research of the Institution are colored by a closed-mindedness which can hardly be considered scholarly.

It would be permissible for an independent institution to have any goals it wished. But for two reasons, fighting communism is improper as a goal for the Hoover.

The obligation for the Institution to be open-minded, scholarly, and non-political arises from its staggering stockpile of vital documents and from its affiliation with Stanford.

First there is a heavy responsibility to employ the documents for objective research. Second Hoover's affiliation with Stanford calls for it to be at least as scholarly as the rest of the University. The tax-exempt status *requires* it to be non-political.

As the Hoover has grown from preeminence as a library to become a major center for research and publication, its right-wing political activities have become more apparent.

The statements of the director and the attitudes of the staff can hardly be considered open-minded. The pattern of appointments to the staff of Hoover, the publication of some works and the rejection of others, and the narrow viewpoint expressed in some research projects clearly indicates the tenor and spirit of the Institution.

It seems ridiculous to suggest that the unscholarly definition Herbert Hoover gave to the Institution should continue to dominate its operation. However, the director has concurred with that definition and has built upon it.

We would recommend drastic changes in the operation of the Hoover Institution. The fundamental change must take place in its relation to the University.

If proper controls were established, no director or founder would be able to create an institution in his own image. The Stanford Trustees Resolution of 1959, granting Hoover its near autonomy, must be altered to give the faculty and the administration of the University and the rest of the staff at Hoover some voice in what goes on there.

The appointment of the director now reverts solely to the President and the Trustees after the death of Mr. Hoover. The appointment of the staff, however, still remains in the hands of the director. These must be made by a broader group, including the University faculty.

Finally the University and maybe the Internal Revenue Service ought to give a close look at the tax-exempt status which the Institution enjoys as a part of Stanford. We have difficulty viewing the Hoover Institution as non-political.



WALLACE STERLING

BARON LOUIS SCHEYUEN
Belgian Ambassador

W. GLENN CAMPBELL
Director, Hoover Institution

HERBERT HOOVER JR.

Johnson Telegram Highlights *Stanford Daily* 10/2/67 Hoover Building Dedication

By MARTA MAHONEY

A congratulatory telegram from President Lyndon B. Johnson highlighted yesterday's dedication of the Lou Henry Hoover addition to the Hoover Institution.

Former Presidents Dwight Eisenhower and Harry Truman, Governor Ronald Reagan, Senator Robert Kennedy, King Baudoin of Belgium, and Yen Chia-kan, Vice-President of the Republic of China also sent messages of congratulation to the Institution.

In addition to the Lou Henry Hoover building, named for President Hoover's wife, two remodeled areas in the main tower—The Jeremiah Milbank Room and the Nicolas A. de Basilly Room—were also dedicated.

"It is fitting," said Johnson, "that the wife of this world-renowned statesman and late President should be memorialized by the great university that prepared him for public life."

Senator Kennedy wired, "I know that this new facility will bring an increased awareness of and appreciation for President Hoover's contributions to our country as well as continue to foster the goals and high ideals of the Institution."

The Lou Henry Hoover Building will be used for the Institution's Chinese and Japanese collections and general overflow. The Milbank Room is the renovated main reading room in Hoover Tower, while the Nicolas de Basilly Room contains the personal library and records of Nicolas de Basilly, an Imperial

Russian diplomat, which were donated to the Institution by his widow.

Speakers at the dedication ceremonies included President J. E. Wallace Sterling, W. Parmer Fuller III, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Trustee David Packard, a member of the Hoover Institution's Advisory Board, W. Glenn Campbell, Director of the Hoover Institution, Herbert Hoover, Jr., undersecretary of state under President Eisenhower, and Baron Louis Scheyven, Belgian Ambassador to the United States.

Campbell, who presided during the speeches, named Hoover as "Stanford's greatest graduate," and pointed out that Mrs. Hoover was a great woman in her own right. Baron Scheyven, the next speaker, noted Hoover's own service to humanity in a message he read from King Baudoin of Belgium: "My people and I remain deeply indebted to President Hoover. Not only did he organize food relief to our long-suffering population during World War I, but he also contributed in a very substantial way, to bring closer together the American and Belgian intellectual elite."

Herbert Hoover, Jr. expressed the gratitude of the Hoover family at the naming of the new building for Mrs. Hoover.

Trustee David Packard praised Hoover's service to the public, and his influence on the business world. "Service to humanity was not a common characteristic of the worlds of commerce and industry . . . Mr. Hoover radically changed this . . . toward a higher ethic in business affairs. Hoover is part of the Stan-

ford tradition of graduates who have served their fellow men in practical as well as intellectual areas."

W. Parmer Fuller, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, began his speech by saying, "I haven't dedicated very many buildings . . . I had some practice when I assisted at the dedication of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, but I was on probation, so they left my name off the program."

Sterling Ended It

President Sterling ended the ceremonies by examining the role of the Hoover Institution in world affairs. "When I first met the Hoover Institution," he said, "it was eleven years old, and it was then already making its mark among those libraries whose strength relates to particular problems and periods . . . In 1941 when the Hoover Tower was dedicated, nations had not yet learned the lessons which the Hoover resources were and are intended to teach . . . To foresee . . . when nations will be able to lay down their swords is impossible . . ."

The dedication climaxed the first day of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace's conference, "Fifty Years of Communism in Russia." In today's lectures Lewis Feuer of the University of Toronto will discuss "The Socio-Political Transformation of Soviet Society," and G. Warren Nutter of the University of Virginia will speak on "The Soviet Economy, A Retrospect and a Prospect." Tomorrow's subjects include Soviet diplomacy, law, and science and an evening address on "National Security" by U.S. Senator Henry M. Jackson.

★ ★ ★

★ ★ ★